

SPEECH
OF
GEN. JOHN A. LOGAN,
AT
Morris, Illinois, September 1st, 1868.

THE CHARGE OF REPUBLICAN EXTRAVAGANCE REFUTED.—DEMOCRATIC
FINANCIERING.—HOW THEIR THEORIES WOULD OPERATE IN
PRACTICE.—RECONSTRUCTION.—SHALL SEYMOUR
UNDO WHAT GRANT HAS ACCOMPLISHED?

THE GREAT ISSUE OF THE CAMPAIGN---PEACE OR WAR!

The following is a correct report, supervised by Gen. Logan himself, of his great speech at Morris, Grundy county, Ill., on Tuesday, Sept. 1:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I am always pleased to meet so many of my fellow-citizens and constituents, and to have the opportunity of addressing them in reference to the questions that are of great importance to the people of this nation. I am always delighted to address an Illinois audience, for the reason that I was born and reared in this State. All that I am, or ever may be, I owe to the people of this great and glorious Prairie State of ours; and I delight to converse with you, to mingle with them, and to discuss those great questions, the decision of which is to promote or defeat their interests.

We have before us now great and important issues. We are now entering into a Presidential campaign, that the people may decide as to which party, or which of the leaders of the two great parties in this country, shall control the affairs of this nation for the next four years.

In arriving at a conclusion upon this matter, it is well for us to examine these questions in detail, and to understand well the true issues which are presented to the people for their decision. If we are governed simply by the idea of a name, of what we have been heretofore politically, we may do the State a great injury. Let us, then, calmly and coolly, as honest men, discuss the questions that are now before the country in such a manner that we may all understand them; and, when we once understand them, let us cast our abilities on the side which we believe will be the most advantageous to the interests of the American people. When we do that, we act

like honest men and like Christians, and do our whole duty. Some men vote the Democratic ticket because they have been in the habit of doing it, and others, probably, vote the Republican ticket because they have been in the habit of doing it; but that is not the way to decide these questions. They ought to be decided by our reason and by our judgment, and we ought to be actuated by honest motives and opinions throughout.

THEIR CLAIMS FOR POPULAR SUPPORT.

What claims, then, have we to your suffrages, either as Republicans or Democrats? Now, I presume that if you were going to decide a question between two of your neighbors in reference to some dispute, you would examine all sides and try to decide honestly between those two men. If you were going into any business relations of life with an individual, you would examine something about his integrity, about his history. You would want to know something about his past conduct before you would enter into any alliance or any business combinations with him. That is the manner in which men ought honestly to arrive at a conclusion as to what they will do in a certain case. Now, if this is proper for us in our every-day transactions of life, it seems to me it is just as proper for us when we, the people who make the Government, come to act in reference to the institutions of the Government.

THE TWO PARTIES.

Let us, then, look at the two great parties as they present themselves to the country. The Democratic party claims your votes to-day in favor of their candidates. They say to you, "Vote with the Democratic party, and we will bring you peace and prosperity!" They say that they will give you happiness in

this country; that they will lighten the burthens of the people; that they will do all that ought to be done that would be calculated to benefit the interest of this great American people. The Republican party say the same.

How, then, are you to judge as to which party will comply with their promises in good faith? I know no better way of arriving at a conclusion than to examine and ascertain which one has heretofore kept good faith with the people—which one has heretofore complied with their contract and with their promises to the letter; and if either party has so done—if either party has done all that it promised it would do—then it is worthy of your confidence and trust. But, if either party has failed to do that, it is unworthy of your confidence and trust.

FIRST—THE CLAIMS OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

Now, let us examine, first, the claims of the Democratic party. What are its claims? For nearly forty years prior to 1860, the Democratic party had control of the affairs of this great country. This was a Government established for the benefit of the people. In fact, its principles were enunciated and maintained for the benefit of mankind. Their influences were felt all over God's green earth. We have a great expanse of territory. We have great wealth in our mineral resources, in the richness of our soil, in our rivers, our mountains, and our valleys. There is no spot that God has given to man that is so productive as are the acres within the confines of this great country. And with all these advantages, and with a civilized, cultivated, and Christianized people, any party in this country ought to give us peace and prosperity.

What, then, did the Democratic party do for you during the time it controlled the affairs of this nation? At the end of the thirty or forty years for which they had the control of this country—when the people became tired of their administration and notified them, as a party, that they must retire from power, and that they would now place the power in the hands of a different party, known as the Republican party, headed by Abraham Lincoln, one of the greatest men, in my judgment, that ever lived or died for his country [cheers], when they were notified to give up the trust which had been reposed in them, I ask you, as honest men, both Democrats and Republicans, to reflect for one moment and ask yourselves the question, "How was this great trust executed and carried out in the hands of the Democratic party?" When they turned over the affairs of this Government to the Republican party, did they give you peace? Did they give you prosperity? Did they give you happiness? Did the majestic king of day send his rays upon this earth upon a happy and prosperous people at the time when you decided that the Democratic party must clean up the house and give it into the possession of somebody else? No, my countrymen; when that noble patriot, Abraham Lincoln, by the voice of the American people, had been made the Chief Magistrate of this nation, when he extended his hand to receive the Constitution and the laws, the flag, the peace, happiness, and prosperity of this country, that he might perpetuate it along with the life of the nation, how was it handed over to him? Instead of the Constitution being turned over to

him as in days of yore, there were *two* Constitutions in the land—the old Constitution, and the Constitution called the Constitution of the Confederate States of America. How was it with your flag? The old stars and stripes, it is true, was known, revered, and loved in the Northern States, but when it waved over the Capitol of Washington, there was one known as the "stars and bars," in the hands of rebels, shaken in your faces, and your own flag was insulted, trailed in the dust, and fired upon by men reared, protected, and nurtured by you and by the people of this country! Instead of peace, they gave you war! Instead of happiness and prosperity, they gave you misery and adversity! Instead of the rivers flowing on gently and undisputed, they turned them over to you colored with the blood of human beings, with the blood of loyal men, until the earth groaned beneath the weight of this terrific war carried on for the destruction of this country. Instead of turning over to you a treasury full of wealth, they turned over to you a treasury empty—without a dollar. Instead of handing over the arsenals, and the arms of this country that had been provided by the people for their protection and the protection of the laws and the Constitution of this country, the arms were turned over to the enemies of the country to make war against the institutions of this free Republic of ours. Your country was bankrupt. There was no navy. There was no army. There were no arms. All were plundered. War and adversity, bloodshed, murder, and crime, were turned over as the legacy of the Democratic party into the hands of the Republican party.

The Democrats may say, "It was not us who did this!" If not, will the Democrats—if there are any here—please to tell me who did do it? [A voice, "They did it!" Cheers.] It certainly was not the Republican party. No Republican joined in making a Confederate Constitution. No Republican joined in organizing an armed rebellion. No Republican joined in trailing your flag in the dust. No Republican joined in trampling the Constitution under foot. No Republican fired upon your flag, robbed your arsenals or made war upon your forts. This was from the hands of the Democratic party as their offering, after having controlled this country for forty years.

And let me ask you as honest men—Republicans or Democrats—what have the Democratic party done since the time when they turned over war instead of peace, which should encourage you to trust them? What claims have they upon the people of this country? I demand to know if there is one single claim that can be put forth in justice by this Democratic party as a reason why they should now have control of this great Government of ours. Why shall they have control of it? You had control of it, and you tried to destroy it! Why shall you have control again? For the purpose of trying to destroy it again? Is that the reason you must again have control of it? If that is not it, what reason is there why you should have control? During the war you all know well what was the conduct of the majority of this party. In the South, they were in armed rebellion against the Government. In the North, they sympathized with their brothers in the South. Now, forsooth, they say, "True,"—this the Southern Democracy tell you—"True! We did set the house on fire! We did try to de-

stroy it, and you put the fire out; but now, gentlemen, you must leave the house, and we will take possession of it and control it! [Laughter and cheers] It is true, they say, "that when we saw the old ship of State sailing over boisterous and troubled seas, loaded and freighted with the hopes and prospects of a great nation like this, we did go on as part of the crew; we cut the rigging, and we bored holes in the vessel; we tried to sink it, and you saved it from sinking, but now, we propose—although we did try to sink the craft—now, we propose to take the helm and guide it, and turn you gentlemen, who saved it, out." [Cheers and laughter]

These, then, are the claims of the Democracy to the control of this Government. What are the claims of the Republican party to control the affairs of this nation?

THE CLAIMS OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

Have they committed treason against the Government? Have they tried to sink the old Ship of State? [Cries "No!" "No!"] Have they set your house—the tabernacle of liberty—on fire? Have they assailed your Government? What have they done that they, to-day, should be turned out of power, and their place given to these other men? What are the crimes of this Republican party? Why they are these: The Republican party did not take the flag in one hand and the Constitution in the other, and open the Constitution and hold it up in the face of rebels and say, "Read ye there, and obey what ye read!" [Prolonged cheers] And they shook the flag in the face of these men until they trembled and their knees smote together as the knees of Belshazzar when he saw the hand-writing on the wall! And that was the action of the Republican party! [Cheers and applause] They did snatch this Government from the jaws of treason. They did control this nation during this war. They did suppress the rebellion. They did cause the old banner of justice and equality and liberty to be once more unfurled upon every mountain's top and in every valley, and in every town and hamlet of this whole country. [Cheers] They did make rebels lay down their arms and bow in ample submission to that old flag and Constitution of ours [Hearty cheers.] After having made war against treason; after having suppressed rebellion armed with a million of men for the destruction of your Government; after having saved your country, your flag, and your Constitution, and brought peace to this land; having given us now the great road blazed and known to prosperity and future happiness; after having done all these things, I ask you why shall you decide that they are not qualified to control the affairs of this nation.

The Democratic party, however, say to you, "This Republican party is an extravagant party." They say to you that we have violated the Constitution; they say to you that we are trampling the laws of the country under foot. Well, it does come in good taste from these Democrats, South, especially, to say to us that we have violated the Constitution of the United States. [Derisive laughter] They warred against it, to destroy it, for four years. We saved it. And now they say we are violating it, and they are the only men who can preserve that Constitution. [Laughter.]

They disobeyed the law for four years, and we enforced the law, and as soon as we have enforced obedience to that law, they say we are trampling it under foot, forsooth, and that they must have control, so as to execute the law. Well, let us examine this, and see if we can answer some of the charges they make against us.

THE CHARGE OF EXTRAVAGANCE.

In reference to extravagance. What have we been extravagant in. I want to know? Why, the Democracy have the effrontery to stand up before an intelligent community and compare the expenses of Mr. Lincoln's administration with the expenses of Mr. Buchanan's administration, and then they say to you that we have expended more money than they did, and show you what Mr. Buchanan's administration expended. Well, that is true! We did—of course we did expend much more than was disbursed in his time. Why? Why we armed nearly two millions of men, and we paid those two millions of men for their services to their country. To do what? We expended nearly three billions of money to do what! To put down a rebellion that had been inaugurated "by the Democratic party in the South—a d the expenses of doing that, they now charge was and say "the Republican party has been extravagant. [Laughter and applause] Mr. Buchanan had no war. If the rebellion had commenced a year sooner, Mr. Buchanan wouldn't have tried to have suppressed it, for he thought it was unconstitutional to coerce a State, and we thought differently. We expended that money in the suppression of treason and rebellion, that we might have peace in this land again, and that we might have a Government, and that liberty might live, and that treason might die. We did that for that purpose, and in doing that they say we have been extravagant.

In other words, according to the Democratic theory, we did wrong in expending money to suppress the rebellion. ["No," "No"] If we had not done that, though, the rebellion would not have been suppressed.

The result is, according to their logic, that the rebellion ought not to have been suppressed. Why? Because we did expend the money to put down treason, and they charge us with not having done right in so expending it. We did it to suppress a Democratic rebellion, as I have said, and we are glad we could get the money to lay out in that way. I am one of those who have voted to pay it, and I intend to so vote again, if you shall once more see fit to send me back. [Great applause—"The best thing you have said"—"Good," "Good"—"We will every time"—Great enthusiasm.]

Now, they say we have not only freed the negro, but we have organized a Bureau called the Freedmen's Bureau, for his benefit. Well, my fellow-citizens, I do admit the accusation; I admit that we did free the negro. True it is, we did it! During the progress of the war, we found four millions of men that had been enslaved—wrongfully, in my judgment—and the war produced the emancipation of those bondmen. We did strike the shackles from their limbs, and did allow those four millions of human beings to come forth from the darkness and midnight of slavery into the glorious sunlight of liberty,

that they might sing psalms and shout joyfully thereafter, because we had so liberated them. And these myriads thus freed, can go before their God and shout up as you and I can, and say, "I am a free man, and this country belongs to me as much as it does to any other human being within its borders." [Intense enthusiasm. Cheers.]

THE FREEDMEN'S BUREAU.

They charge us, as I remarked, with having organized a Freedman's Bureau. Well, we have done that. But why did we organize it? Because we found four millions of black people down there, without land, without homes, without labor, without education, and without men of means to give them labor to perform, that they might make a livelihood. We found a great many white people who were in the very same condition—"hear" "hear"—so far as that was concerned. We organized this Bureau, because we had some humanity existing among us—we organized it for the benefit of human beings, that they might get labor and make a living for themselves.

I would ask any Democrat here to-day this plain question: Suppose there were four millions of people turned loose right out here in this region, without homes, without anything whatever to make a living with, without ploughs, horses, cattle, or any means whatever of gaining a dollar, without bread or education to help them wrest it from the great world; without any possible opportunity of providing the barest support for their starving families. If there be a Democrat here to-day I ask him to stand up and say if he could see these four million of people, whether white, black or red—I care not what the color—starve to death without giving one cent to ameliorate their condition? If there be such a one—I hope and trust for the sake of all that is good among us poor mortals, that there is not—but if there be such a one, I say that man is not fit to live in a civilized and Christian community. I care not who he is. [Cheers and intense excitement.]

WHAT IT HAS COST.

But what has this Freedmen's Bureau cost? They say you have been taxed to death to pay the expenses of taking care of the negroes. I say there isn't a man here, within the sound of my voice, who has ever paid one cent of taxes for the support of the Freedman's Bureau—not one! Why do I say that? I say it for this reason. The Freedmen's Bureau has cost, in three years and a half, seven millions, nine hundred and thirty-five thousand, two hundred and eighty-three dollars and seventeen cents. That is the total expense of the Freedmen's Bureau. Some of the Democratic orators say it has cost ten millions a year. But I give you the facts—and that is the total cost of carrying on that institution for the three and a half years that it has been in existence. Since it has been in operation we have levied a special tax on cotton; that cotton was raised by the laborers who were without any employment, but were given it through that Bureau. In the ten rebel States where it was particularly in operation, the revenue derived from that cotton tax—the cotton being produced remember, by these men who were protected by this Bureau—amounted to how much? To \$66,162,864 77, and the Government thus, through the agency of this Bureau—through the labor set to work by it—derived as the result of that labor, this sixty mil-

lions of revenue, and expended therefrom to keep it in operation, a little over seven million. [Great applause.] Now, if these statements be true, I ask you to tell me what expense that Bureau has been to the country? And, let me say right here, that we took off that cotton tax, during this last session of Congress. Up to that time it had produced that much revenue and enough to run the Bureau for seven or eight years longer, if we had desired to continue it in operation that long. But we passed a law abolishing the Freedmen's Bureau (which will take effect on the 1st of January next) for the reason that these States are organized in such a manner that these people have labor to do, can make a living under the laws of these States, and therefore we put this matter under the control of the States themselves.

Now let us see if these charges of extravagance go any farther, and let us see what the Republican party has done. They say that we have been increasing the public debt instead of diminishing it. I am very sorry to find men in this country who will state to an intelligent people that which has no truth in it whatever. I say to you that from the time the war closed, up to the present time, no party, no set of men—whether you call them statesmen or not—has ever lifted so great burthens from a people, and paid so much of a debt, as has the Republican party since the rebellion was closed up. Let us look at the figures, because figures won't lie, and these that I shall read to you are taken from the official reports of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of War, and the heads of all the different departments. I give them to you as they have given them.

REDUCTION OF THE PUBLIC DEBT.

In 1865 the public debt was \$2,757,689,571 43. Since 1865 we have reduced this debt about \$100,000,000 per annum. The debt now is \$2,510,245,886 74—making a reduction of over \$247,000,000 in the national debt—and that has been done by a Republican Congress. Yet these men charge us with extravagance!

What more? We have paid, annually, \$138,000,000 interest on the public debt! We have reduced the taxation of the people. In the Thirty-ninth Congress, we, by one act, relieved taxation from articles that had produced \$60,000,000; and at the next session of the same Congress, we relieved the people from taxation to the extent of \$41,000,000. This last session of Congress, the Fortieth Congress, we relieved articles from taxation that had produced us \$90,000,000 making \$191,000,000 of taxation that has been taken off the people by this Republican party, represented by the Thirty-ninth and Fortieth Congress, since the war closed.

Taking these facts and these figures, I ask you to tell me where there is a party, or set of men, that can do more than has been done to release the people from their burthens, than has been done by the Republicans? [Great applause.]

We paid—I don't desire to go into all these figures—but we paid, during the war, too, over \$800,000,000 of debt as we went along—during Mr. Lincoln's administration. Then, since his administration, we found ourselves indebted in the amount I have stated. We have, to re-

capitulate, reduced that debt nearly \$100,000,000 per annum since the war, paid interest and relieved the nation from taxation to the extent of \$191,000,000.

ECONOMY OF REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Now, let us examine a little further, and see where, upon the Democratic basis, we are charged with extravagance. Mr. Buchanan's administration, without war, with no army, with hardly any expense, with a great deal fewer people in number than we have to-day, expended about \$89,000,000—something like that—for one year. What are the expenses of this Government to-day? We had, according to the last census, some 31,000,000 of population. We have had a devastating war; the Government is growing; immense expenses have arisen that were not known before—and what are our appropriations for carrying on the Government for this fiscal year commencing last June and ending in 1869? Let us compare the cost of the administration, as carried on by a Republican Congress, with that of Mr. Buchanan or anybody else, taking into consideration the population, the necessities and the wants of this great country. You must remember that we have had to keep troops down South, and have had to reorganize those States, and have had very large extra expenses to pay, since the war ended. The last appropriations, for this fiscal year were as follows:

Executive, legislative, and judicial, embracing all departments, salaries and expenses.....	\$ 17,480,000
For the army.....	33,081,013
For the navy.....	17,500,000
West Point Military Academy.....	303,000
Consular and Diplomatic service.....	1,206,434
Post office Department.....	2,500,000
Indian Bureau, treaties, etc.....	2,500,000
Rivers and harbors.....	4,700,000
Collecting the revenue.....	9,969,000
Sundry civil expenditures connected with the various departments.....	3,020,000
Miscellaneous expenses of all kinds, including cost of certain public buildings throughout the country, expense of closing up Freedmen's Bureau, &c.....	9,000,000
Deficiencies of various kinds in the different appropriations.....	2,560,000

Making a total of..... \$168,818,417

These are the total appropriations made by this Republican Congress, for meeting all the expenses of the Government, including the Freedmen's Bureau, the army, the navy, and everything else. On the other hand, the expenses of Mr. Buchanan's administration amounted, as I have remarked, to over \$80,000,000—something like \$89,000,000—I don't remember exactly the amount, in gold. We run the Government for \$168,000,000, in currency. Now, I ask you, as honest men, to tell me wherefore this charge of extravagance against the Republican party? It is true that to run the Government last year and the year before cost us a good deal more money—\$203,940,537.42. But what was that for? We had a large army and were reducing it; we were paying the expenses of reconstructing these States; we were paying the expenses of the Freedmen's Bureau; we were paying the expenses of an Indian war, away out on the Plains, and we were paying pensions and bounties. In fact, almost the majority of this money was

appropriated to provide bounties to the soldiers, and that is not an ordinary expense of the Government. Yet in the face of these facts, these people charge us with extravagance in meeting the expenses consequent upon winding up the war—paying bounties and everything of that kind in settling up. Now, since that is done, or nearly done, we run the Government on \$168,000,000 in currency—less money, according to the value of currency, to-day, than Mr. Buchanan's administration cost the last year of it.

THE DEBT SHALL BE PAID.

Now, my fellow-citizens, I want to add, inasmuch as I am upon this subject of expense, that our debt being \$2,510,000,000 and a little over, we, the Republican party, propose to pay that debt. [Cheers and great applause.] That is to say, if we control the Government. We propose that that debt shall be paid. [Renewed applause.] And not only paid, but we also propose that the Democrats and rebels, or rebels and Democrats [applause] shall help pay it. [Frenzied enthusiasm.] Yes, we propose that. [Loud applause.]

Now, how do we intend to do that? I differ with the Democracy in this country. I am not in a hurry to pay this, and I will give you my reasons for saying and feeling so. Our proposition is to liquidate this debt in twenty-five, thirty, or forty years? And why do we propose to do that? Because, in that length of time, owing now \$2,510,000,000. If we reduce the public debt as rapidly as we have within the last two years—now long will it take to pay it, reducing taxation at the same time? Why, we shall cancel it in twenty-five years. At the same time, mind that, at the same time, doing away with taxation almost entirely. We will pay it in twenty-five years, without our feeling it, by a tariff that will not be oppressive to the people, and by a light income tax, together with a small tax upon the luxuries of life. That is the policy of the Republican party. [Great applause and long cheering.]

THE FUNDING BILL.

We proposed, this last Congress, to fund this debt, and to fund it so that the interest would only be four to four and a half per cent., instead of five and six per cent. But Mr. Johnson stuck the bill in his pocket, and it didn't become a law. But according to the platform of the Republican meeting, we make the proposition to reduce the interest on the public debt and thereby lighten the burdens of the people. And we propose to do it, not by passing a law that a man shall take this thing for that, but to do it in such a way that it will cause the bondholders to exchange the one bond for the other, by letting that other run a time, at a lower rate of interest, as is the policy of England and other European powers, because the great capitalists prefer a bond running thirty or forty years, instead of, say ten, as it saves them the trouble of reinvesting the money. And for that reason a bond running for a long term of years is better than one running for a short term, and can be put upon the market at a lower rate of interest.

THE "GREENBACK PLAN" OF PAYMENT.

This is our plan of paying the public debt. The Democratic party propose to pay it differently. I do not agree with them, as I remarked, in their proposition. They say they

are in favor of paying it within five years. They want it paid right off. They say, "You are paying six per cent. interest on this great debt all the time." That is true (or the most of it). You pay six per cent. on about \$1,600,000,000, and five per cent. on the balance—that is at the rate of six per cent. on the 5-20s, and five per cent. on the 10-40s, in gold. They say that while we are paying that interest, they want to stop that interest. How do they propose to stop that interest. It's the easiest thing in the world to do—the way they propose to do it. [Laughter.] They say they want to stop this interest by issuing greenbacks to pay off this debt, and they have a sump speech on that point that is calculated to deceive a great many ignorant people. It won't deceive any man of ordinary sense and information, but it may deceive a man who is destitute of that article that is very necessary in a country where a man should understand his business, and the affairs of the nation. [Laughter and applause.]

We have now \$700,000,000 of currency. Over \$350,000,000 of it is in United States Treasury notes, and the balance in National Bank notes. They say they propose to pay off the interest of these bonds—the National Bank bonds that are deposited as collaterals, and all the bonds in the hands of the bondholders—because they are mad at the bondholder. They don't like him, they say he is a rich man and an aristocrat, and they want him paid off—they want to lift the burthens off the shoulders of the people. They are going to issue, beside the \$700,000,000 of currency we now have, a fresh lot.

How much is this we now have worth? Gold is worth 144 in New York. You have got to pay one dollar and forty-four cents in greenbacks for a dollar in gold. You have got \$700,000,000 currency and over \$1,600,000,000 in 5-20 bonds. Suppose you had \$700,000,000 of this currency to pay off \$700,000,000 of these 5-20 bonds. Take your seven million and reduce your currency forty per cent.; how much does that leave? And then take \$700,000,000 more and reduce it—that would be a reduction of 80 per cent. and on the top of that, suppose we issued \$900,000,000, to make up the \$1,600,000,000 of 5-20s—how much would that reduce it, then? [Great applause.] Then your "greenback" would be about gone—wouldn't it? [Great applause and laughter.] And that is the way they propose to pay the national debt! They propose to issue "greenbacks" and pay it off, and stop the interest.

HOW IT WOULD WORK.

Now, suppose you, for a short time, examine this question as sensible men. Suppose we issue sixteen or five hundred millions of "greenbacks," to pay off these bonds and stop the interest, how much do you make by that? The say currency is good enough for the bondholder. But, "that ain't the question." The question is—how does it affect the people? You are the men to be considered. The money goes into your hands. It is issued by the Government, and the bondholder gets them for his bonds, but he pays them directly over to you. He buys your horses, your cattle, your land, your products—for that is what you sell your produce for—and if there is any loss on it, who loses it? You are the men who lose it. The farmers, the mechanics, the laborer, are the men who

must receive it, and they are the men in whose hands it must depreciate, and they are the men who must be responsible. But if they have not the gold and silver to pay off these \$1,600,000,000 of bonds and liquidate them instead in greenbacks, how are you going to pay off the greenbacks, when issued? We have got to pay them in something. They issue ten or sixteen hundred millions of greenbacks to pay off all the bonds, because they haven't the gold, to-day, to pay off the bonds. Then when you get the greenbacks, and come to a bank, have them redeemed, what will you you have to redeem them with. [Applause.] You have got no gold to do that with, and your currency will be worth nothing. Your money will be just in the condition the rebel's money was over here in Richmond, Va. He had been over there in the rebellion and had been making cannon for the Confederacy. When he went there the money was first rate. Confederate money was good enough. He got up in the morning, put a two dollar bill in his vest pocket, took his basket on his arm to buy his breakfast, which he would bring home in his basket and have it about full. He staid there a year or so, and he said he then had to take the basket to carry his money in, and could almost bring his breakfast back in his vest pocket. [Laughter.] And we would be in that condition precisely, if you were to pay off this debt in the manner the Democracy want to pay it.

Let us illustrate it another way. These bondholders have your bond and my bond—that is, they have the bond of the Government, paying interest at six per cent. We agreed to give these men six and five per cent. if they would lend us money to prosecute the war. They have got these bonds, then, and we owe them six or five per cent. interest on them. Suppose now we apply this situation to the case of an individual, and let us illustrate by that what we have to do—for we all want to be honest. Suppose you, my friend, are in distress. You are in a difficulty about a law-suit, say, with somebody, you want money in order to prosecute your law suit, or to get out of your difficulty—no matter what it is. You go to a neighbor and borrow money of him, and give him a note drawing 10 per cent. You give him a note—he has lent you his money—you get out of your difficulty. As soon as you are fairly out of it he wants you to pay him, and you say, "Yes, I will pay you." How—how are you going to pay your debt? According to the Democratic theory, you will give him a new note, *drawing no interest*. That is the doctrine; that is it, precisely. [Laughter and applause.] Now, is that an honest transaction, I would ask any man? I heard a story the other day, of a conversation between two Irishmen, that illustrates it perfectly. [Here occurred a slight disturbance near the stand; cries of "Take him out."]

Gen. Logan—Let him alone!

A Voice—"He's a Copperhead!"

Gen. Logan—That makes no difference; let him be!

Well, there were two Irishmen, not long ago, discussing this question involved in the Democratic platform. One owed the other \$100, and had given a note drawing ten per cent interest. The man who held the note was a Democrat, and the other was "sort'er

sliding off," and about concluding that the "Dimmicrats" were not all right, and to him his creditor was explaining the platform of Seymour and his party. Says he:

"We propose to pay off the bonds with greenbacks."

"How is that?"

"We propose to pay off the bonds in greenbacks and stop the interest."

"Won't there be any interest on the greenbacks?"

"Devil a bit—pay 'em widout it."

"I like that, be gorra! That is fust rate. I like that."

So, after they had got through their confab, our friend presents to his debtor the note, and he says, "Yaas, I will pay it; I'll give ye a fresh note durawing 'no intrist; this one draws tin per cent." [Great laughter and applause.] And that is the manner in which the Democracy propose to pay our National debt.

MORE ABOUT DEMOCRATIC FINANCIERING.

But they say they want the some kind of money for the bondholder as the pensioner; the same kind of money for the farmer as the bondholder. Nobody objects to that. If you want your money, you want it now, if your debt is due. The debt is due the pensioner, and he wants his money, and he gets it in greenbacks—because that is all the money we have got.

The bondholders debt is not due—but they propose to make him take it, whether due or not. I say this is hard. The *bond* is due, in five, twenty, ten, or forty years from now—and then let us pay the bond and not quarrel about the money! ["That's it"—Applause.] We shall have money then, and we will pay the debt and will pay it with money at par, in my judgment. At least we will pay the pensioner and the bondholder, as the debt of each comes due, in the money their bond calls for, or according to the contract—it makes no difference which. If we have got gold to pay the bond holder, we have gold to pay the pensioner, and if we have not gold to pay the bondholder, we have not to pay the pensioner. So it is, and all this talk about one kind of currency for the bondholder, when his debt is *not* due, and another kind of currency for the pensioner, when *his* debt is due, is all wrong. We pay the pensioner and the farmer in the money we have, and we have no kind of money except greenbacks to pay that debt, and everybody knows it. These men who are so anxious to pay off these debts now, are anxious to repudiate this debt, and that is all there is to it. ["That's it"—Great applause.] Because if they pay them greenbacks, they must issue them in order to do it, and they wouldn't be worth a cent a bushel, and the debt would amount to nothing. That is all there is of that! [Great enthusiasm.] That is the reason this plan is advocated by the rebels. That is one reason why it is favored by the Democrats—and because they hated the war and everything growing out of the war, and that is why they hate the debt, and believe it unconstitutional, and don't want to pay it. ["Yes," "yes." Great applause.]

TAXING THE BONDS.

They say they are in favor of taxing bonds. I am in favor of taxing bonds, but not in the same way they are. We have taxed the bonds

—we tax them now—five per cent. on the interest of the bond—an income tax; the same a man pays who has a thousand dollars over and above his debts and dues; they are taxed in the same way.

But these Democrats say to you that the bondholder don't pay any school tax; that he don't pay any county tax; that he don't pay any State tax, and hence that he has an advantage over the farmer and mechanic. Now I wish we could all be honest and tell the truth—it's the best way. We would then get along better, and then everybody would understand us.

The Democratic party claims to be a constitutional party, they claim to be a law-abiding party. If they are, let me put one question to them: if it is unlawful and unconstitutional for a State to tax a Government bond? I suppose a Democrat would not be in favor of it. It seems to me he ought not. Now, don't you remember that during a previous Democratic administration we borrowed money? We owed some fifty odd millions of dollars to carry on the Mexican war. We gave our bonds, bearing a certain interest, and we only paid the last of those bonds last January. Did you ever hear a Democrat, in all your life, during a Democratic administration, argue in favor of taxing these Government bonds that they themselves had given during the Mexican war? ["No" "Never."] I guess not! And they never were taxed. Why? *Why?* There was a reason for it. They claim to be law-abiding men—men who would obey the Constitution. An attempt was made to tax them, and what was the result? It went to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court of the United States have decided in four or five different cases that a State or municipality could not tax a national bond or the national debt. Then if the Supreme Court of the United States, the highest authority, has decided thus, I ask them if the Republican party did not want to violate the law by passing a statute to tax a thing that cannot be taxed according to the decision of the Supreme Court. I ask whose fault it is—or rather is there any fault about it—any wrong committed? Now, the Democrats don't even allude to what the Supreme Court has decided. But, here not long ago, the Supreme Court decided the same principle. Upon what principle was this decision rendered? It was upon this principle, that the National Government must be the protector of its own credit; the National Government is responsible for its own debt, and it *must* be for its own credit. Suppose the National Government should give a State the authority to tax its bonds, and one of the States, or eleven of them, as has already happened, should be in rebellion against the Government—or, in other words, should be in opposition to the Government and wanted to destroy the credit of the Government. That State would tax these bonds at such a rate as to depreciate them much below par and bring doubt upon the credit of the National Government, and, in that way, make your taxes much higher than they are, in order that the Government might pay the bonds.

Now, if you had to raise \$2,000,000,000, to-day, I ask you to tell me this? Suppose—well, say this is the Government, here, and you want to raise \$2,000,000,000. You go into the market and you say, "We want to

borrow \$2,000,000,000," and the man who has the money to lend, says, "Yes, I will loan you the money, but can't some of the crowd go off and tax these bonds?" You say, "No, they can't do it, because we propose to maintain our credit, and hence we can't allow a little faction of us to destroy the credit of the whole." Then the man says, "Very well, upon the faith of the whole, that the credit will not be destroyed, I will loan the money."

It is the Government credit that you cannot tax; and any State that taxes the bonds is taxing the national credit, and is depreciating it thereby. The National Government cannot allow the sovereignty of a State to be higher in authority than the National Government is itself. Why this principal would ruin any Government. It is the principle upon which these men seceded. They seceded because they set the State authority higher than the national authority; they said a State was sovereign, and that a citizen owed his allegiance to his State over and above that which he owed to the National Government. They seceded on these propositions. Now, if you turn around and claim for a State, authority to tax the national credit, and thus give it higher authority than the National Government, it is the same principle upon which these Southern men seceded from the Government and destroyed the national credit. Now, I say to you, as your Representative, although it may look hard for a man to be right by your side and own bond and pay no school tax, whatever, on his bonds, it is the national credit that he has got, and that national credit must be preserved, not by him, but by the whole people. Hence, the whole people cannot allow that man's bonds to be taxed to the destruction of the credit of the Government, although they might be glad to make him pay a tax equally with his neighbor; but by making him do that and benefiting a few, you destroy the whole, because you destroy the credit of the Government. Hence, for individual purposes, and for the purpose of satisfying a few men—and there are but few of them—the National Government cannot permit its credit to be destroyed in this way. That is the reason for it, and the Supreme Court have so held. The Republican party to day are taxing the national bonds just as far as they can go under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. I do not presume anybody wants us to violate the highest law of the land known under the Constitution. Then, my fellow-citizens, on this question of the taxation of bonds we proposed, as I said, to tax the bonds. We have done it by putting an income tax on them. I introduced a proposition in Congress to tax the body of the bonds for national purposes a cent and a quarter, or one and a half per cent. I do not remember now exactly what it was, but it was not done. Democrats and Republicans both opposed it—both did it. It was not a party matter at all. It was only a question as to how much tax can the bonds bear and keep the credit of the Government up. You can find nobody in Congress I presume, whether a Democrat or Republican, but what is willing to put a national tax on the national bonds as much as the bonds can bear, and not destroy the credit of the Government; that far we can go and no farther can we go. As an honest man, a law-abiding man; that far am I willing to go, and no farther am I willing to go.

HOW THE REPUBLICAN PARTY HAS ADJUSTED TAXATION.

Now, my fellow-citizens, let us examine this question of taxation from another standpoint. As I remarked to you, the Republican party propose to pay this debt by a taxation of luxuries as we have been doing, and the Democratic party say to you that you are taxing us to death. Now, what tax, I want to know, according to the Republican theory, do the people of this country pay to the National Government? You pay your county tax, and your State tax, and perhaps they are heavy. I don't know how that is, but what taxes do you pay the National Government? They talk about poor people. I say the policy of the Republican party is the protection of the poor men. It is the protection of the mechanic, of the laboring men, or the farmer, and of the farming classes, and whenever you change the policy that the Republicans have adopted now, you take the burdens off from the rich men, and off from the manufacturers, and off from the merchants, and put them on the shoulders of the poor men. What tax does the poor man pay in this country? I will venture the assertion to day, that there isn't a poor man in this country that pays this year, one cent of tax to the National Government—not one. Why? [A Democrat—"He does when he buys his coffee!"] "When he buys his coffee?" Well, that is exactly a Democratic argument. He does, when he buys anything—he pays for it, that is all. He pays no taxes. When I say taxes, I mean that you pay taxes to the tax-collector, and get your tax receipt for taxes. I will talk about that "coffee matter" after a while, and talk to your satisfaction. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, how is it? If you are worth one thousand dollars, that is to say if your income—not your property—but your income (that is, your profits over and above your debts) is one thousand dollars at the end of the year, then you pay five per cent. on that thousand dollars as an income tax. If you are a manufacturer, then you pay what is called a manufacturer's tax; you pay a tax upon sales if you are a merchant; if you are a gas manufacturer you pay a tax upon that; if you are a manufacturer of cosmetics or patent medicines you pay a similar tax—a two cent tax upon so much of each article of a certain kind, and that is the tax that is paid.

Now, what poor man in this country has an income over and above his debts at the end of the year—clear gain over and above all that he expends—of \$1,000 in cash. I want to know? If a man has an income of \$1,000 over and above all his expenses, I don't think that man is a laboring man. That man generally is considered a man of very fair means, of very fair circumstances, and is not poor, and ought not to get mad if he has to pay a little tax on that \$1,000 income. I wish I had several thousand dollars just that way. I would pay the tax all the while and not grumble a bit. [Laughter and applause.] And now there are other men who have to pay taxes; Members of Congress have to pay taxes; their salary is \$5,000 a year, and they pay \$250 tax; that is called an income though I know no Member of Congress ever gets away from Washington with a dollar. [Laughter.] Hence you find, according to law, and according to the Republican theory, that the tax comes off of the office-holder and of the rich men, and

not off of the mechanic, and the laborer, and the poor man. The poor people of this country pay no national tax, none whatever. But, as my attention has been called to one item, I will mention it. The Democratic party say we pay a tax on coffee, on sugar, on boots, on shoes, on everything. They say we pay a tariff on it. Well, now, let me tell you how it is. If this Democratic party would only examine the statistics a little clearer they would see how it is. In sugar, or coffee, or anything else the price is either higher or lower, according to the supply and the demand, and when there was a greater supply of sugar and coffee than there was demand, your coffee was worth, perhaps six or eight cents a pound less; but when the supply is not sufficient for the demand, then your coffee and sugar increased in price according to the demand—and that is the condition to day. This is no tax on coffee. There is no such thing. There is no tax on sugar or coffee; there is a duty, and a light one too; but that is all. And yet they talk about tax on coffee and sugar, and on calicoes, and prints, and everything of this kind.

The war made cotton high, because the cotton was not produced in sufficient quantities to supply the demand, hence all things manufactured out of cotton were correspondingly high as the cotton was high. So it is in everything else. And now, mark you, since the war has stopped, and cotton has increased, you find the demand has been no less, but has been better supplied, and reduction in price had gradually gone on. Cotton has decreased in price along since the war, according to the supply, and so have fabrics manufactured from cotton. But so far as a tariff was concerned, we, the people of this country, as a matter of course are not in favor of a very extravagantly high protective tariff. We cannot be that. But we must derive revenue from some source to run the Government and to pay our national debt. I say to you, the time has not been, either under Democratic administration, Whig, or Republican, but what there was a tariff duty imported articles. But we have reduced the tariff on all the articles as fast as we could; and we have taken it off of the articles as fast as we could take it off, just the same as we have done in relation to a direct tax, and as we go on increasing in wealth and population, and as we are relieved from the burden of this debt, just so fast the tariff duty will be reduced, correspondingly with the reduction of the direct tax upon the people; and that is the only way it can be done. You cannot do it in any other way. Elect whom you are a mind to, you will have tariff, and you will have taxes; there is no question about that.

Now, in relation to the tax on whisky, and that is a tax that has been complained of a great deal. [Laughter.] Now it never effected me very much, because I don't use the article. But I don't blame the Democratic party for feeling mad at us for taxing whisky. [Laughter.] I know that they do complain of that tax very much, and that is about the only tax they recollect. [Laughter.] Well, to satisfy them, we did reduce it down to sixty cents per gallon, and I guess they are mad about that. [Laughter.] We reduced the tax on tobacco, too. Now, I think that tobacco and whisky, and gas, and articles of that kind, can

produce the whole revenue of this Government, in combination with our tariff duties that are imposed upon our foreign goods. That is my notion about it, and that is the theory of the party, too. We consider whisky and tobacco, and things of that kind, a luxury, or at least a great many people do, and if they do and will have them, let them pay for the luxuries, that is all—[applause]—and that is one reason why some people, and all the Democrats, are all the time making a noise about the high taxes because it strikes the articles that they use in great abundance. [Applause and laughter.]

THE DEMOCRATIC PLAN OF TAXATION.

Now, suppose we examine the Democratic platform and contrast it with our theory in reference to the question of taxation. They say that they are in favor of equal taxation of every species of property. Now, that old gentleman that was out there a while ago, a Democrat, I want him to listen to me about the Democratic platform [laughter], and I will read it. I have given you our theory of taxation, and now let us see what their theory is. They say we are taxing the people to death; they want to pay the debt; they want to do all these sort of things, but they say that the Republicans are destroying the country. The fourth resolution of their platform, adopted at New York, is in the following language:

"Equal taxation of every species of property, according to its real value, including Government bonds and other public securities."

That is to say, in order to get at the taxation of bonds and other public securities, the Democratic party are in favor of taxing every species of property equally. Now, I am not in favor of that. "Every species of property;" what is that? It is a horse, it is a mule, it is a cow, it is your house, it is your bed, it is your bread, your meat, your knives, your forks, and your dishes. [Laughter and applause.] They are all property. Every species of property they are in favor of taxing equally, in order to get a claim to tax some fellow's bonds. In other words, equal taxation means that they will tax milk the same as you tax whisky; they will tax sugar the same as you tax tobacco, and they will tax prayer-meetings the same as you tax circuses. I suppose [laughter] that is equal taxation. [Laughter.] Everything must be taxed.

Now that is the Democratic theory. How do they propose to collect this tax, and how do they propose to tax you poor men to-day that do not pay the National Government one cent of tax? According to the Democratic platform you would have to pay a tax on everything you have got. And yet some of you say that you are "for the Democratic party, you know." [Laughter and applause.] You are opposed to taxation, but you are for the party that is in favor of universal taxation. Now, I can't understand that, but that is the idea precisely. Not only that, but they propose to tax everything according to its real value. Who is to value it? The man who is appointed by the National Government to tax your property is not elected by the people; then when he comes around he won't say to you, "How much is your house worth," and take your word for it, but will value it himself, and according to its real value. You

will have to pay heavy taxes, according to the Democratic theory, in order that they may get a chance to tax somebody's bonds.

THE DEMOCRATIC THEORY PRACTICALLY APPLIED.

Let us see the effect of that. In order to illustrate this idea, suppose that the revenues of the Government had to be \$363,832,400 per annum. Suppose that was the national revenue, and we will say that there are 4,080 counties in the Government, and that the average value of the property is eleven millions per county. They will average that much. Take them and aggregate it, and it will average more; but I am just making an average of the amount for the purpose of getting at a positive sum, or fact, that will be the result.

The whole value of real and personal property in the United States would be \$44,880,000,000; then there would be that amount to be taxed, and if you would tax it 81-100 of one per cent, then you would derive a revenue of \$363,528,000. The amount of Government bonds not taxed now is only about \$300,000,000; the balance are taxed—I mean by the income tax.

In order, then, to get at the taxation of these other \$300,000,000 of bonds, or say \$600,000,000 of bonds, or any amount not now taxed, it makes no difference whatever, just to illustrate. The tax on \$300,000,000, if we take that amount at 81-100 of one per cent, would be \$240,000. That would be the tax derived from \$300,000,000 of bonds. And you will see by this, that the farmers and laborers paying taxes on all species of property would pay only \$363,288,000, while the bondholders not taxed now would pay \$240,000. Then the whole burthen of the national debt would be taken off the bankers, and stock jobbers, and lawyers, and doctors, and the brokers of this country, and be placed upon property. Then if you place the tax upon property according to this theory, making it \$44,000,000,000 worth of property in the Government, and our debt \$2,000,000,000 to-day, making it one twenty-second part of the national property, and then tax the whole amount of property in the Government, it would leave but a very small proportion of it to be paid by the bondholders, these men that the Democratic party want to get at. You would pay taxes on \$4,000,000,000 of property, while they would pay taxes, perhaps, on \$300,000,000 more than they do; or if they paid no taxes to-day, they would pay taxes on \$2,000,000,000 of bonds, while you would pay taxes on \$44,000,000,000. That is the difference.

The property holders, the farmer, and the mechanic who owns his house, and his lot and lease, and things of this kind, would pay that amount more than would these bondholders, that the Democratic party are so anxious to get at. Now let us see what would be the relative amount each class would pay—making the comparison, I mean, of the amount that would be paid by the bondholder, and the merchant, and the doctor, and the lawyer, and the farmer, and the mechanic. The bondholder would pay, according to this statement, \$1,476,059 of the national debt by taxation, while the farmer, mechanic, and laboring man would pay \$2,352,394,100; there would be the relative propor-

tion that the farming community and the laboring men would pay as compared with the proportion that the bondholders would pay. Then if that is the kind of taxes—and that is the kind according to the Democratic theory—if that is the kind, you, gentlemen, won't vote for the Democratic ticket, because that is the kind suggested now according to their platform, if they have told the truth, and the presumption is that they did. [Voice—"I guess they did." Laughter.]

Now, my fellow-citizens, it is very easy to see that this method of taxation is destructive, to the people instead of being beneficial to the people. Nobody ever heard of such a proportion before. Now why is it that they do this? It is because they want to pay these bonds off and stop the interest they draw. Well, in order to meet this argument, argument that we use when we say, "When you pay the bonds off in greenbacks, your greenbacks will be of no account," they stick in this resolution of equal taxation of every species of property in order to pay the debt; that is they will pay the bonds in greenbacks and then turn around and tax you to death in the five years in which this debt is to be paid—out of the proceeds of which taxation they will have to pay these greenbacks—if they are to make their greenbacks worth a cent. There is the result precisely; they have got to tax you this way if they pay the debt according to this theory. Well, if they do that, you just calculate the per cent, and I tell you to-day that the per cent. or rate of taxation according to the Democratic theory would take every particle of property that you have got in the same length of time that we, according to our proposition, would pay the national debt.

THE RECONSTRUCTION ISSUE.

I do not propose to discuss this question of taxation any further. But I propose now, for a short time, to answer some other arguments that the Democratic party has made to the people of this country. They are in favor, they say, of undoing that which the Republican party has done. That is to say, they are in favor of destroying the State Governments that have been organized by the Republican party in those States that were in rebellion against the Government, because, they say, that our organization is unconstitutional; that it is a violation of right; a violation of law; a violation of the Constitution. Now let us see whether it is or not.

When this rebellion ended we found these States without civil government. We found them there with a government organized in rebellion against the lawful constitutional authorities of the United States. We did not recognize it, hence, there was no government in existence in those States. Mr Johnson undertook to organize them by putting rebels in power. We organized them by making the basis of that State Government loyalty. We said in terms, that "the rock upon which this Government shall be founded, shall be liberty and loyalty to this Union, and upon that basis shall you organize these State Governments, or else they shall not be organized." [Loud applause.] We did organize them in that way. We organized them, and gave to every man that had been loyal the right to participate in the reorganization of that State Government.

We adopted what are known as the thirteenth and fourteenth articles of amendment to the Constitution. In that thirteenth amendment we abolished slavery everywhere. In the fourteenth amendment we provided that any person who had taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and afterward voluntarily entered into this rebellion, should not be qualified to hold office under the National or State Government, after the adoption of that amendment to the Constitution. We did adopt that article. We provided, further, that the national debt should be paid, and that the pensions and bounties to soldiers should not be questioned, but that the rebel debt that was created by the rebellion against the Government should not be paid by the National Government, or by the States that incurred the debt. [Great cheers and applause]. We provided, further, that the emancipation of the slaves should not incur the responsibility for the payment of them by the United States. These propositions were put forth as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. They have been adopted, and on this basis we reconstructed those ten States in accordance with those propositions; but now we are told that all that we have done shall be undone; that the Republican rule has been of such character as that it must be undone by the Democracy, by overturning those State Governments, and instead of giving us peace it will bring upon us revolution and bloodshed again.

In opposition to that theory, we said to them, we have organized them on a loyal basis, and we intend to protect them in their present organization; and, whenever you, by the force of arms, or of the army, as you propose to do, undertake to overturn those State Governments you are in rebellion against the lawfully constituted authorities of this Government once more, and we will suppress your rebellion once more." [Great applause. Cries of "That's right!" "We did it!"]

But they say that in your organization of these States you have carried them over into the hands of "carpet-baggers." Well it is very strange—it is passing strange—that a man must be called a "carpet-bagger," because he happens to be born in Illinois and has gone to make his home in Louisiana. I suppose the Democratic party would not nominate anybody for office unless he happened to be born and resided in the very State where they held the convention. Mr. O'Brien was a Democrat or a "carpet-bagger" from Ireland. You suppose they would like for me to say that. Now I have no objection to him because he was born in Ireland. I have no objection to him myself on that account in the world. I have none of that prejudice I never had. And if it belongs to our men that have gone South, I may say that it equally belongs to the men here. But the trouble is this: Our men that are down there, that they call "carpet baggers," used to be boys that wore the blue in this war. When they go there, and these men send them back to us crowned with honor, as members of Congress, they are denounced by the Democrats there as "scalawags" and "carpet-baggers," and by the Democrats here in the Northern States, that used to be their neighbors and friends. If a rebel comes North and lives in any of your towns, nobody insults him; nobody drives

him out of the community; nobody tries to murder him. He is treated as a peaceable and quiet citizen as long as he behaves himself. But if a loyal Republican chooses to go down South he must be shot, or murdered, or driven out of the country; and if the people there, the loyal people, happen to elect him to office, he is denounced for everything in the world, just because he happened to be a loyal man. But if he should go down there, happening to be a rebel, then he would not be a "carpet-bagger," but then he would be all right, for the reason that he happened to agree with them when they made their war against the Government of the United States. Now, I say this, if a man moves into this district, and lives here as long as the law requires him, and you nominate him for office, he has as good a right to hold that office as anybody. We were not all born here; we do not all reside here; but we cast our lots together, and when we do, after the law has expanded itself upon us, in reference to its limitation of time, then we have the same rights as other men have. So it is with those men down there; so long as they have conformed to law, and are within the provision and meaning of the law, they are entitled to any possession that the law will give them. And I honor them for doing it. I honor the people down there for giving these people a possession down there, because these men are loyal men, and they deserve it.

THE OPPOSING CANDIDATES.

Passing now from the question of the reconstruction of those States, and, having examined the greater portion of the points or questions which are at issue between the two great parties, I propose now, for a short time, to glance at the candidates of those two parties, the manner in which they have been placed before the country, and the reasons why they should be supported by the people of this country. Take the history of the Democratic party, and the history of the Republican party. They are as different as day is from night. The history of the Democratic party is the history of tyranny, oppression, and bloodshed. The history of the Republican party is the history of good faith to the people; of economy; of loyalty; of love for the flag, the Constitution, and the Union; and such a history as that each and every man belonging to it to-day ought to be proud that he is embraced within it in company with those who are laboring for the salvation of the country, and has participated in making this great history which belongs to it to-day.

What, then, are the claims of these parties through their representatives, the men they have nominated as candidates for President and Vice-President? The Democratic party has nominated Horatio Seymour, of New York, as a candidate for President, and Francis P. Blair as a candidate for Vice-President. Why have they nominated those men? Is it because they are more loyal and true than others; or is it because they are greater statesmen than are known in this country; or what reason can there be found why they should have nominated these two men for these two great offices for which it has placed them before the country?

They say, and we must take their word, and that which supports it, and argue and reason

in reference to these two men by what is said, and what we know of them ourselves, they say that Horatio Seymour is a great statesman, and that our candidate is not a statesman. They say that their man is not only a great statesman, but that he has done great work for this nation at different times as a great statesman and true man; and that our man is a humbug—a silent man—a quiet man—an ignorant man—and a man whose fortune has been made by accident, and not by ability. Let us see whether that is true or not, and let us see, too, who are the men who indorse these several candidates.

SEYMOUR AND GRANT CONTRASTED.

A Democratic Convention met in New York, and put this man forth as the great statesman of the age. Compare him, then, with this little, quiet, peaceable, honest, and faithful patriot from the State of Illinois, who heads the Republican ticket for the Chief Magistracy of this nation. In 1861, when war was heard in the land, and dark and angry clouds were hovering around and about us, and threatening to engulf us, Horatio Seymour was heard to say, in a speech he made in New York city, that the coercion of those States was unconstitutional, and, therefore, it could not be indulged in; that it was unlawful to secede from the Government, true, but that it was just as unlawful to coerce a State as it was for the State to secede. How should it be decided? It was a question, according to Mr. Seymour's theory, that must be decided as a legal proposition and not by the arbitrament of the sword. If you carry out that theory it will only lead to this conclusion: that, when Beauregard fired upon Fort Sumter, if Seymour had been President of the United States he would have issued a warrant as Chief Magistrate for the arrest of Peter T. Beauregard—for what? Not for treason, because it is unlawful to coerce a man for treason, he could not have issued it for that, but he would have issued it as the great Justice of the Peace of the nation against him for assault and battery upon Fort Sumter—[laughter and applause]—and he would have had him tried by some Justice of the Peace for an assault. The Justice of the Peace would have opened Mr. Seymour's speech and he would have read, "It is unlawful to secede, it is true, but it is equally unlawful to coerce a State." "Therefore," the Justice would say, "I decide that there is no trespass in the case" [shouts and laughter], and that would have been the end of it. Mr. Beauregard would have been acquitted, because it was just as lawful for him to do it as it was for us to coerce him; because the law could not be enforced against him, and that would have been the whole of it. That would be a peaceful settlement of the revolution in the Confederate States, according to Horatio Seymour.

And while he was making this speech and telling the people that coercing a State was unlawful and unconstitutional, what was this little, quiet man, Grant, doing? He was quietly collecting his forces down here at Cairo, in Illinois, and when he got them ready he marched them upon Fort Donelson, and drew his sword and said, "Boys, double-shot these cannon and give them a loyal speech from their red-hot throats!" and they did so. [A voice, "We'll do it again!"] I tell you

5000' rebels surrendered, and said, "It is lawful for us to be coerced by Ulysses S. Grant."

So it was in 1863, while we were investing Vicksburg, and while the battle of Gettysburg was raging, a mob in New York city was aroused against the execution of the law known as the Draft law. Mr. Seymour was in the city and addressed them as his friends, saying although the law was wrong, yet he wanted peace and quiet; that he had written a letter to the President already, to have the question legally settled, so as to have no bloodshed and no trouble. But Mr. Lincoln "didn't see it." Mr. Lincoln concluded that he hadn't time to have the question tried by the Supreme Court. Why? Because the battle of Gettysburg was then raging. Lee was invading Pennsylvania and we were then firing upon Vicksburg where there were thirty-two thousand rebels opposed to us, and Grant made the same speech that he made at Donelson. It was not wordy, it was not flowery, but it was powerful. It was not flowery. It brought the rebels to terms, and they again surrendered to that man, Grant. There was the contrast between the loyalty and statesmanship of the two men on two different occasions. So it followed on clear through the war, and Mr. Seymour continued declaring that it was unconstitutional, and in 1864, at Chicago, when the Convention convened there—on the 3d day of August I believe it was—he being President of that convention, it was declared in that convention, that four years of war to restore the Union had proved to be a failure, and that a further prosecution of the war would lead to anarchy and misrule. That was the language of that convention, and of Horatio Seymour, as its President.

When the result of it was heard in the armies, you could hear the shouts on the other side of the lines among the rebels. On our side, just at daybreak next morning, they heard our shout. It was not a rebel yell, that made night or day hideous, it was the sound of loyal artillery, that made them obey the Constitution and the laws of the land. [Great applause.] And we followed it up, making these same kind of speeches under this man, Grant, until Lee and Johnson surrendered to him and Sherman, and the whole armies of the Confederate States and the rebellion was wiped out, and Grant came marching home at the head of the army, with the laurel wreaths upon his brow, and upon the brow of each and every veteran, with tears rolling down their cheeks, because they had left far away from home their brothers that had given up their lives that their country might live. As they came home and met the loyal millions with open arms, cheer after cheer went up from the crowds, and on the old Capitol, on Capitol Hill, in Washington, was written in large letters there as we marched down Pennsylvania avenue, "There is but one debt this Government can never pay, and that is, the debt of gratitude that it owes to the loyal man that saved this country in its hour of trial." The people were glad.

The people were proud of Grant; they loved him; his soldiers all over the land love him because they know him to be an honest man—a patriot and a true man. And yet these men in contrasting Seymour with Grant, say that Grant is a simple minded man that was made by accident; that his fortune and fame were made by accident. If a man can win a

hundred battles, and never lose one; if a man can capture the whole rebel army at one time; if a man can unite a country that has been severed for four years; if a man can give you one flag when there are two flags in a country, and one Constitution where there are two; if a man can give you union where there was disunion; if a man can give you quiet and peace when war and bloodshed reigned; if he can give you harmony throughout the land; if he can suppress treason and make rebels cower and tremble before him, I ask you to tell me if that man is an ignorant man. If that man is such a man, in God's name give us a great many more just like him. [Applause]

And whom do these people represent? Compare the people that are represented by these two men.

THEIR CONSTITUENTS.

Horatio Seymour represents nine out of every ten of the rebels in the United States of America. Horatio Seymour is the nominee and the candidate, to-day of every man in this land that sympathized with the rebellion. He is the candidate of rebellion, of sympathy with rebellion, of treason and the Democratic party. I won't say that the Democratic party are traitors. I make no such accusation. But I do say that Horatio Seymour is the nominee of traitors, of sympathizers with traitors and the Democratic party. What kind of a convention nominated this man Seymour? In that convention there were eighty-two—I believe it was—men representing a number of rebel States. Out of the eighty-two representing certain rebel States there was but one man who had worn the loyal blue of this country—there was but one man who had fired against the rebels in this land; and who was that? That man was Joe Williams, from Tennessee, a black man. Although they hate the negro, they had to bring one along with them to give respectability and loyalty to their convention. [Applause]. Who composed the balance of these men? When Francis P. Blair, after Mr. Seymour had been nominated as candidate for President—Francis P. Blair, a man against whom I have sought to say as a soldier and a gentleman, but against his politics I have a right to say—when they nominated him, after writing his letter to Col. Broadhead, of St. Louis, in which he declared that the force of the army must be used, in the event of the Democratic President being elected, in order to undo all that the Republican party had done, and when they had declared in their platform that all we had done in the reconstruction of these States was unconstitutional, when that letter was understood by the rebels in that convention, they thought, inasmuch as Blair had been a soldier, had been a General in our army, that they could use him to deceive the people of the North more easily than they could anybody else. When he had pledged himself, in that letter, to incur even bloodshed to bring about the destruction of the overruling of the Governments down there, as he said, to disperse them and put them in the power of the rebels, when he had done that, and he was nominated, let me ask you how it was done, and by whom it was done. Gen. Preston, of Kentucky—you might think, by my calling him General, he belonged to our side,

but he did not—Gen. Preston nominated him as a candidate for Vice-President of the Democracy. In his letter which he had written he had said that he would go before that convention; that he would go down on no other principles than that of that letter, which was the undoing of all that the Republican party had done in reconstructing these rebel States. When he was nominated by Gen. Preston, who seconded that nomination? I presume there are men right here to-day—I have no doubt some at least—that traveled with our Western army through South Carolina. If there are, they recollect that I commanded the Fifteenth Corps, in the advance, on the right, through South Carolina. They will remember that some of my foragers were shot and some were hung, and tickets pinned upon their breasts, "Death to all foragers." Some of the boys that went out to get provisions after we had started on the march with fifteen days' provisions and had been out forty days—when they went out to get them, when they were digging potatoes and such like, were met by Wade Hampton and his men, who surrounded them as they were digging something to eat, and hung them and put tickets on their breasts on which was written "Death to foragers;" and this man Wade Hampton, this murderer, this plunderer, this assassin, was the man who seconded the nomination of Blair on that occasion, and when he raised to do it he was received with one universal shout by that whole convention. Who was the next man that stepped forward to second the nomination? Napoleon Bonaparte Forrest. Who is he? He is the man that, at Fort Pillow, according to a report that has been laid before Congress, signed by Republicans and a Democrat, too, all testifying to the fact, that when Fort Pillow was captured, he permitted his men to take sick soldiers (colored however they were, and that has been said to excuse it), took sick soldiers from their beds and tied them down in the tents, sick and suffering as they were, firing their tents and burning them to death. This man allowed men to stand them up to the walls and shoot them down, and in some instances made them shoot each other. And this man seconded the nomination of Seymour and Blair in the Democratic Convention. I say to you—both Republicans and Democrats—that whenever I have to belong to a party that will take such men as Wade Hampton and Forrest into a convention to nominate me or any of my friends for office, and they are recognized there on an equality with us, I will bid farewell that party. I don't care by what name it is called; it makes no difference to me; I can't associate with them, nor with such a party; and I will not affiliate with them. [Cries "You are right!"] And these men to-day are advocating this course of the Democratic party. Forrest is stumping Tennessee advocating the election of these men Seymour and Blair; and Hampton is stumping South Carolina, and all the rebels, with few exceptions, are to day announcing themselves in favor of this policy of Blair, declaring that the time shall come when

"THE LOST CAUSE"

will be regained under Seymour and Blair. That is the issue before this country. That is the issue for you to examine, and that is the kind of convention that nominates Seymour for the chief magis-

tracy of this land. I ask you Democrats that are here—I ask any of you, and as honest men I want you to tell me—after the war we have had, after the bloodshed and desolation we have had, how many of you desire, to-day, to turn this country over to such men as Forrest, Hampton and that class of men? If you elect Seymour and Blair, won't you do it? Do you suppose that being President he could refuse to appoint to office men if they were recommended properly, who had been in the convention that nominated him for President. Certainly not. If you recognized them in convention you must recognize them as qualified to hold office; as men qualified to control the country, and all the Southern country would be governed by these people. This is the feast that you Democrats are invited to to-day by these men, Seymour and Blair, and by the Democratic Convention.

THE TWO CONVENTIONS.

Now, my countrymen, how was it? Let us examine the convention on the other side, for a few moments. Let us contrast with that convention the convention which nominated Gen. Grant. The convention that nominated Gen. Grant met in Chicago. Who composed that convention? There were 630 odd delegates in that convention. Who were they? Why, these rebels say we had one rebel there, and he must balance against their eighty two rebels. We had Gov. Brown, of Georgia there, a man who was a rebel, it is true, that is, in sympathy, but a man who never had entered the rebel army, and who, after the rebels had laid down their arms, took up the nation's cause and was in favor of reconstructing these loyal States. I am not, however, the advocate of Gov. Brown, for I am the advocate of no man who has ever been a rebel. But, at the same time, this man was not a rebel in the same sense that the other men were. But take that convention; there were 800 delegates in it who had served honorably in the war in favor of their Government; the balance of them were loyal men, who had stayed at home and supported and assisted us as good and true men, who helped us to sustain the Government, and they are entitled to just as much credit, if they did their duty at home, as if they had done their duty in the field. [Cheers.] We did not as-semble and have three or four days of wrangling, cheating, and buying delegates, and swindling one another. We had no such thing as that which happened in New York—fighting for Chase, for Johnson, for Pendleton, for Seymour, and God Almighty knows for how many more, I cannot tell, all of them who wanted to be candidates for President. When we met together we met like men.

We asked one another what was best for the whole country, not what is the best for this man, or what is the best for that man, or this clique, or that clique, but we said this man was the great Captain that led us to victory. He is the man that saved the country. He is the man that brought back our flag honored, and saved it from dishonor and disgrace. He is at the head to-day of all the great men in the country and in the history of the world. He is a man both of military skill and genius, and he is honest and resolute and all his acts show him to be a statesman, he is an honest man, a true man, and a just man. Many of us said this to one another. On the

battle-field often we had seen that loyal, quiet man, that is so villainously denounced to-day, as he rode along the lines where death had scattered its victims, like the grass falling beneath the mower's scythe; and there we have seen the tear trickling down his cheek as he looked around and saw what death had wrought, and then he turned his face away that he might shed this tear. We have seen that man's sympathy with the mother, with the sister, with the widow, and with the orphan, and taking all these things together, our minds and wishes at once jumped as quick as lightning to the conclusion, this is the man that saved the Union in time of war, he is the man that can preserve the Union and keep peace in time of peace. And with one universal acclaim the name of Ulysses S. Grant was placed before the country as the nominee for President of the United States of America.

SCHUYLER COLFAX.

Then, when we nominated the second man on the ticket, Schuyler Colfax won the day. There were many candidates, but finally the convention settled on him. He is a man of ability, an honest man, a loyal man; a good, a true man, as everybody knows. With him I am satisfied; and in my judgment every loyal man in this land ought not only to be satisfied, but ought to be proud that we have so good a man at the end of the ticket. So it is for the head, and should the Chief Magistrate die, there would be associated with him sufficient ability, capacity and loyalty to preserve the country as handed over by death into his hands.

Now, my fellow citizens, you have the platform, you have the candidates, and you have the policy of both parties. Let me ask you, as honest men, to tell me, with these facts all before us, if there is an honest man in this country that it would require one minute to make up his mind as to which one of these men, or as to which party, or as to the candidate of which party he would support and put the control of the Government in the hands of? It is peace on one side, in my judgment, and war on the other. If you elect Grant and Colfax you will have peace. Because, let me tell you, that man Grant will keep peace. These rebels know it, and that is the reason they do not want him to be President. [Great applause.] With Seymour and Blair you will have revolution, in my judgment; with Grant and Colfax you will have peace and prosperity, in my judgment. Now, if there are any soldiers here—["Here's one"] I want to ask them this question; let me illustrate our position as soldiers, because you know that there is a sympathy between us that hardly ever exists between other men. It matters not how much we may differ in politics, we have yet a respect the one for the other, if we show we have each done our duty in the cause of our country. That is universally so among soldiers, if they are Democratic soldiers or Republican soldiers. Suppose, for the purpose of looking at this thing in the light of a soldier, we soldiers could have the matter arranged according to our own taste to-day. Suppose that we had a stand built on this side of the street, and one on the opposite side of the street. Suppose that we had Seymour, and Blair, and the Democratic Convention on the platform on this side of the street; Forrest on his right, Wade Hampton on his left, Joe Wil-

lions behind him a little, and the balance of the rebels bringing up the rear. Suppose on the other side we had Grant, and Colfax, and the 630 men in the Chicago Convention (300 of that number had served in the Union army) Suppose we had that arrangement, and suppose we had the power to call from their graves the 300 000 martyred brothers who sleep in the far-off vale, and who died that you and I might have protection. Suppose that we could bring all the widows in their weeds, and the orphans, and the one-legged and the one-armed soldiers, and we could place them in one grand row along that street, and pass them in review between these two conventions. I ask you, soldiers, if you could stand at one side and see that grand review, as it marched by these two stands, how you would be affected? As the 300 000 sainted martyrs passed by, clothed in white as spirits from above, casting their eyes to the right and left, there would be Grant and his 300 soldier followers (and no rebels on his stand), shedding tears of mourning over the ones that were left behind. These spirits could say to them, wedded for your benefit, and for your protection. When they turned their faces toward the stand on this side, what could they say? "Mr. Seymour, you said we could not save this country, that the draft was unconstitutional. You said the war was a failure; you signed a platform that said the farther prosecution of it would lead to anarchy and misrule. You have been nominated for the Presidency, and there are your friends who represent your party sitting about you. "Here is Forrest," says one, "who butchered me." Another cries, "I am the spirit of that man who was burned by that murderer Forrest, who sits there, while I was lying sick in my tent." Another one says to Wade Hampton: "I am the man upon whose breast was pinned a ticket that my General and friends might see that I had been hanged while foraging in South Carolina." And these rebels sit there and see these men as they go by, followed by the widows, who hold up their weeds and say, "That stand bears the man that caused me to be dressed in mourning to-day." As the one-legged man goes by, holding up his crutch, he cries out: "You are the man that caused me to have but one leg;" the one-armed man would shake his stump at Forrest, and Hampton, and Preston, and their rebel brothers, and say: "You men are the cause of my being a cripple for life;" and as the child came along, it would prattle and say: "When will my father return? you are the man who gave me not my father back, but made me an orphan; thou art the man who murdered my parent; thou art the man who made my mother a widow." I ask you, soldiers, to-day, if you could stand and gaze upon a scene like that, and then turn around and say: "I will vote for the man who sits upon that platform with his rebels, Forrest and Hampton, and all of them around him, who have made those 300,000 dead brothers arise, and given us half a million of widows and orphans, and crippled, and wounded soldiers. [Never! Never!] I say there is not a soldier to-day, except he has lost his manhood, and there is not one man, except he has lost his patriotism and is not lost to every sense of honor and propriety, in this country, that could gaze upon such a scene as that and refuse to cast his ballot for Grant and his

friends who go along with him, and head the great column of liberty and progress as we go through this land. I ask you men, I ask you women and the children—the little boys and the little girls—to picture a lesson of this kind in your own midst, because, although you may say, "This is one of Logan's fancies," it is not. It is as true as holy writ. There you can see the whole lesson. It is written upon the graves, upon the bodies, upon the arms and legs of men in this country, and upon the clothing of the widows' and the orphans of this whole land; and that lesson was written there by the hands of these men that I have mentioned—who, to-day, are asking you for your suffrages and for the control of this country. I say, in the name of Heaven, in the name of patriotism, in the name of three hundred thousand murdered dead, and in the name of the flag and the Constitution, and all there is that is near and dear to the people of this great land of ours, let us never disgrace ourselves by fighting four years to save a country and then turning it over into the hands of the men who, during that same four years, attempted, to destroy it. ["Never," "never!" and intense excitement.] But let us say, inasmuch as we have saved this land, we will perpetuate its institutions, and will make liberty and progress, and civilization and Christianity, our watchwords. We will make this great country of ours what it should be, by putting it into the hands of men that can protect it. We have preserved it and will perpetuate it. We can and will make it a garden that shall bloom like some of the beautiful gardens of the South, and it shall be—from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Northern lakes to the Gulf—a peaceful and a happy home for the oppressed and the distressed of each and every land of God's world. We will say to the whole world, "Look to us; we are progressing; we are becoming civilized; we are becoming Christianized; we are a people full of humanity; we are a people with our bosoms full of the milk of human kindness; we are a people willing to extend all the privileges and immunities that are given to us to all the people of God's earth, and we open the portals of this great country and invite them here, that when they do come they may look and see that a great tree has been grown in this land, that bears rich fruit—a tree, the roots of which have been watered by the blood of thousands of martyrs, and it is known as the tree of Liberty; each and every man that plucks and eats of the fruit thereof shall inherit a part of the liberty that belongs to mankind in this country." Let us, then, have this, that each may enjoy these privileges, may enjoy these benefits. We can only have them by having peace and quiet in our land. Then, I say, give us men that will give us peace; give us men that will give us quiet, and in less than ten years this country will be that grand and glorious country which no man, to-day, can describe. It will be multiplying by thousands in its population and its wealth. Its history will be written and rewritten, and as it grows and this history expands, the people will be proud, not only of the country, but of the history they have made, and they will live only to preserve that history and perpetuate the liberties they have given to mankind; that they themselves may pay a proper respect to religion, they will invoke the Deity to give us such blessings as shall be showered upon the

heads of a people that do right in all respects, and deal out such justice from one man to another as they themselves would desire to be dealt out to them.

A RESUME.

Now, my fellow-citizens, I desire to read for my conclusion some extracts I have prepared, which, I think, sums up this whole question in a nut-shell:

Why the Democratic party should not be trusted.

First. The Democratic party forces upon the country and the Republican administration the expenditure of more than \$4,000,000,000 from the Treasury.

Second. That the rebellion was begun for the express purpose of overthrowing republican institutions and establishing upon their ruins a slaveholding oligarchy, and that all the burdens of taxation, past, present, and prospective, are the necessary consequences of a Democratic rebellion.

Third. The vast sacrifice of life on the battle-field, and in the hospitals and prisons, is justly due to the treasonable action and purposes of the Democratic leaders.

Fourth. That in the preparation of this rebellion the whole power of the last Democratic administration was exhausted, the public Treasury plundered, the navy scattered or dismantled, the army placed under the command of traitors and carried beyond the reach of the incoming administration, and within the borders of the contemplated revolutionary government.

Fifth. That all these acts were done in obedience to the orders of the Democratic conspirators, and by the advice and with the approval of the Democratic leaders, in every section of the country.

Sixth. These same leaders controlled the Democratic nominating convention, dictated its platform and designated its candidates.

Seventh. That these same leaders by their public orators and press declare it to be their settled policy that Democratic success shall restore to the late Democrats and rebels in arms supremacy in the government of the nation, and that all that was lost by rebel defeat on the battle-field, shall be regained by the election of the Democratic candidates.

Eighth. That they, the Democratic rebel

leaders, affirm only, as the consequence of their triumph, the renewal of the war, the destruction of the reorganized States, and the overthrow of the Republican representative branch of the Government, and its subjection to Executive will and dictation.

Next, why should the Republican party be trusted?

First. That of all its millions of men not one, during the war, was a traitor. Every man stood firmly by liberty, by the Constitution, by the flag, the Constitution and the Union.

Second. That its civil administration of the Government, notwithstanding the exigencies of the war, has saved the people, as compared with Democratic rule, \$80,000,000 within the last eight years, being an average of over \$10,000,000 per annum.

Third. That it has actually paid and cancelled nearly \$1,700,000,000 of the liabilities incurred during the war, and since the close of the war, while steadily reducing the public taxes, it has reduced the public debt from \$2,757,659,539 43 to \$2,510,245,866 74, making a payment of the debt of \$247,413 64 69.

Fourth. That it has reduced taxes on different articles, the two last Congresses—the Twenty-ninth and Fortieth—to \$190,000,000.

Fifth. That but for the obstinacy of the Democrats in Congress and of their plant tool, Andrew Johnson, a reduction of the interest upon the public debt, amounting to at least \$40,000,000 per annum, would have been provided for by the Funding bill.

Sixth. That the Republican party, by its candidates and platform, is irrevocably pledged to economy, to the maintenance of the public faith, the preservation of the peace and the unity of the States, the liberty and prosperity of the people, and that all its pledges in the past have been redeemed, offering the best guarantee of the value of these pledges to the people in the future.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I thank you kindly for the attention you have given me during the time I have detained you with these desultory remarks.

Three cheers were then given for "Logan," and, amid the rush to grasp his hand, this large, attentive, and enthusiastic meeting was adjourned.